



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/570,050	02/27/2006	Yiping Fan	US030282US2	5345
65913	7590	06/26/2007	EXAMINER	
NXP, B.V.			LE, DINH THANH	
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT				
M/S41-SJ			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1109 MCKAY DRIVE			2816	
SAN JOSE, CA 95131				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/26/2007		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/570,050	FAN, YIPING
	Examiner DINH T. LE	Art Unit 2816

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

FINAL REJECTION

The proposed Abstract and drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Correction or clarification is required.

In claim 1, it is unclear what is meant by reciting “a composite filter comprising an electronic circuit including at least two cascading filters”, i.e., it is unclear if the composite filter is different from the electronic circuit and the filters and how the recitation “composite filter”, “electronic circuit” and “filters” is read on the preferred embodiment or seen on the drawings.

The same is true for claim 11.

The remaining claims are dependents from the above claims and therefore also considered indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 9-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as being anticipated by Sawada et al (US 6,693,501).

Regarding claims 1 and 11, Sawada et al discloses in Figures 1, 5A-5B and 8 a circuit comprising an electronic circuit (102, 104, 123 in Figure 8). The electronic circuit including:

- at least two cascading filters (1, 3, Figure 1) having passband ripples (Figures 5A-5B) nearly equal in magnitude and out of phase with respect to each other in order to minimize a passband ripple in the composite filter. Noted that the recitation “composite filter” recited in the preamble is not given patentable weight.

Regarding claims 4 and 14, wherein at least one of the at least two cascading filters comprises an analog filter. Regarding claims 5 and 15, wherein at least one characteristic of the at least two cascading filters (202, 204) is inherently selected to minimize the passband ripple in the composite filter, Figures 5A-5B).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, characterized in that the at least one characteristic comprises the order of the at least two cascading filters.

Regarding claims 9 and 16, characterized in that the at least one characteristic comprises a bandwidth of the at least two cascading filters (Figures 5A-5B).

Regarding claims 10 and 17, characterized in that the at least one characteristic comprises a stopband attenuation of the at least two cascading filters, Figure (5C).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 7-8 and 19-20 are further rejected under 35 USC 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sawada et al (US 6,693,501).

Sawada et al discloses a filter circuit with all of the limitations of the claimed invention as stated above but does not disclose that at least one of the at least two cascading filters comprises a digital filter and claims 3 and 13 or the at least one filter is an even order filter and at least one filter is an odd order filter and the even order and the odd order differ in value by one as recited in claims 7-8 and 19-20. However, as well known in the art, the filter circuit comprises different types such as digital filter and analog filter and the order of the filter circuit can be selected to have a predetermined pass-band. Selecting the type and the orders for the filter for the circuit of Saw et al is considered to be a matter of a design expedient for an engineer depending on a particular environment in which the circuit of Sawada et al is to be used. Lacking of showing any criticality, it would have been obvious to a person having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select the digital filter or the filter orders for the circuit of Sawada et al as claimed for the purpose of provide a predetermined pass-band to accommodate with a requirement of a predetermined system.

Response to Applicant's Arguments

The applicant argues that Sawada does not disclose "a composite filter comprising an electronic circuit including at least two cascading filters." The argument is not persuasive

because Figures 1 and 9 of Sawada clearly shows that the electronic circuit (102, 104, 123 in Figure 8) comprises two cascaded filters (1, 3) of Figure 1. The recitation “composite filter” in the preamble is not given patentable weight. Thus, the rejected claims remain readable on the circuit of Sawada as stated above.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DINH T. LE whose telephone number is (571) 272-1745. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8AM-7PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TIMOTHY CALLAHAN can be reached at (571) 272-1740.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR.

6/11/07



DINH T. LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER